(SRI K. PUTTASWAMY)

member who raised this point was more concerned about the discipline of the students and also the safety of the public who are moving about in the City. I saw a number of students moving round the Secretariat in batches asking for leave. I do not know whether the Ministers are in a position to declare leave.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Is there any scope for discussion on this point now?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I only wanted to know whether Government could enlighten us on this point.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—There is no definite motion before the House. I have already submitted that I will have to make full enquiry with regard to the matter. I have already said what I have heard and that is that the students are urging that they should be granted leave for a week. That is a matter which has to be decided by the University authorities.

MYSORE PUBLIC PREMISES (EVICTION OF UNAUTHORISED OCCUPANTS) BILL, 1959.

Motion for Suspension of Rule 243.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).- Sir, even with regard to the present Bill I am compelled to make a motion for suspending rule 243. The reasons that I advanced on the last occasion hold good on this occasion also. I move the motion with the assurance that hereafter until the Rules of the Upper House are suitably modified we are not going to introduce any Bill in the Upper House involving reference to a Joint Select Committee.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—Is this Bill so important as to refer to a Joint Select Committee?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—The Upper House thought that this Bill should be sent to a Joint Select Committee. There is some force in that. Similar motion has been passed by the Upper House. The Bill does not cost financially.

Sri C. K. RAJIAH SETTY (Chikanaikanahalli) —It does cost something to Government, Sir. This is a simple Bill and need not go to the Select Committee.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Every legislation does cost something. But, unless we coolly consider the several provisions of the Bill, we should not come to conclusions, though this is a very simple Bill.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM (Kolar Gold Fields).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Minister is moving for suspending the rules of procedure. When he moved another Bill the other day, he said it was only for that particular Bill that he was moving for suspending the rules of procedure. Again for the second time he moved for the suspension of the rules of procedure. Now again he has come forward before us and is moving to suspend the rules of procedure. Mr. Speaker, every day they are introducing Bills and we do not know how long we are going to sit and how many Bills are going to be referred to Joint Select Committees.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, I have given a definite assurance to the House that hereafter, we are not going to introduce any Bills in the Upper House until rules are framed. I understand the anxiety of the Members that this House should get adequate representation in the Joint Select Committee. I certainly agree with that sentiment or anxiety.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Not only from the representation point of view but it also involves several points. This is so small a Bill having 13 or 14 clauses. Is it necessary to refer this to a Joint Select Committee?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move :

"That under Rule 322 of the Rles of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly Rule 243 be suspended in its application to the motion for reference to a Joint Select Committee."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That under Rule 322 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly Rule 243 be suspended in its application to the motion for reference to a Joint Select Committee."

The motion was adopted.

Motion to concur in the Appointment of a Joint Select Committee.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House concurs in the appointment of a Joint Select Committee of the two Houses, consisting of a total number of 18 members 12 members from this House and 6 members from the Legislative Council-to consider the Mysore Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorized Occupants) Bill, 1959 and that the following members of this House shall be members of the Joint Select Committee:

Sriyuts:—

1. E. Pundalikappa
2. M. M. Patil
3. Ramachandra Veerappa
4. Mohamed Shariff
5. N. A. Karilingannanavar
6. G. B. Shankar Rao
7. M. S. Kamtikar
8. K. P. Kurumbayya
9. B. R. Patil
10. B. S. Shankarappa
11. B. G. Khot
12. Smt. Dyavamma."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That this House concurs in the appointment of a Joint Select Committee of the two Houses, consisting of a total number of 18 members 12 members from this House and 6 members from the Legislative Council—to consider the Mysore Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Bill, 1959 and that the following members of this House shall be members of the Joint Select Committee.

Sriyuts:—

1. E. Pundalikappa
2. M. M. Patil
3. Ramachandra Veerappa
4. Mohamed Shariff
5. N. A. Karilingannanavar
6. G. B. Shankar Rao
7. M. S. Kamtikar
8. K. P. Kurambayya
9. B. R. Patil
10. B. S. Shankarappa
11. B. G. Khot
12. Smt. Dyavamma."

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, this is a very simple measure. It is intended to secure certain powers to certain officers of Government to evict unauthorised occupants of Government public premises. Public premises means, any permises belonging to Government or allotted to Government or taken on lease or requisitioned by or on behalf of the Government. Premises means, any land or any building or part of a building and includes the garden, grounds and out-houses, if any appertaining to such building or part of a building, and any fittings affixed to such building or part of a building for the more beneficial enjoyment thereof. When such buildings are unauthorisedly occupied by persons, it is open to the competent officer to issue a notice to show cause against eviction. Unauthorised occupation has been defined in clause 2 (e). It may be occupation of any public premises without any authority or it may be occupation after the expiry of the authority previously granted. When the competent officer comes to know that public premises have been unauthorisedly occupied, as I submitted, a notice can be issued calling upon the unauthorised occupant who claims to have any interest in the premises to show cause why eviction order should not be passed against him. After considering the objections, if any, put forward by the unauthorised occupants and after hearing the evidence adduced by the said persons,